REMARKS

Status of Claims

Claims 1-7 and 9-21 are pending in the application. Claim 8 was previously cancelled without prejudice or disclaimer. Claim 22 is cancelled herein without prejudice or disclaimer. Claims 1, 2, 14, 19, and 21 have been amended. Support for the claim amendments may be found in the specification at least at paragraph [0024]. No new matter has been added.

Claims 1-3, 5-7, and 9-21 are Allowable

The Office has rejected claims 1-3, 5-7, and 9-22, under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a), as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0035471 ("Pitsoulakis"), in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,823,480 ("Brown"). Claim 22 has been cancelled without prejudice or disclaimer. Applicants respectfully traverse the remaining rejections.

The cited portions of Pitsoulakis and Brown do not disclose or suggest the specific combination of claim 1. For example, the cited portions of Pitsoulakis and Brown do not disclose or suggest extinguishing a visual indication of accessibility of an information service when the information service is not in operation, as in claim 1.

Pitsoulakis describes a modem with indicator lights to indicate a Digital Subscriber Line (DSL) connection, connection synchronization, and an amount of activity of an access device. For example, Pitsoulakis describes a Light Emitting Diode (LED) that indicates the presence of a synchronized connection when green, that indicates the presence of an unsynchronized connection when yellow, and that indicates no connection when off. Pitsoulakis further describes a linear array of 6 LEDs to indicate activity of an access device. Only a few of the six LEDs are lit when there is only a little amount of activity, and all of the LEDs are lit when activity is at or near 100%. Pitsoulakis, [0034]. The cited portions of Pitsoulakis do not disclose or suggest extinguishing an LED when an information service is not in operation. In Pitsoulakis, the activity LEDs may all be off, indicating no activity, without necessarily indicating that the information service is not in operation. Therefore, the cited portions of Pitsoulakis do not

disclose or suggest extinguishing a visual indication of accessibility of an information service when the information service is not in operation, as in claim 1.

Brown describes a modem 12 in communication with a Cable TV (CATV) provider. A controller 60 of the modem 12 initiates registration of the modem 12. The registration is completed when a configuration of the modem 12 matches a configuration that is previously stored at the CATV head-end. Light Emitting Diodes (LEDs) 89 indicate an on-line state when the configurations match. In Brown, the LEDs may be lit when an information service is not in operation. This is because the configurations can match even though the information service is not in operation. Therefore, the cited portions of Brown do not disclose or suggest extinguishing a visual indication of accessibility of an information service when the information service is not in operation, as in claim 1.

Therefore, the cited portions of Pitsoulakis and Brown, individually or in combination, fail to disclose or suggest the specific combination of claim 1. Hence, claim 1 is allowable. Claims 2-3, 5-7, and 9-13 are also allowable, at least by virtue of their dependence from claim 1.

The cited portions of Pitsoulakis and Brown do not disclose or suggest the specific combination of claim 14. For example, the cited portions of Pitsoulakis and Brown do not disclose or suggest a data detection mechanism operable to extinguish an access signal when a remote information service is not in operation, as in claim 14.

Pitsoulakis describes a modem with indicator lights to indicate a Digital Subscriber Line (DSL) connection, connection synchronization, and an amount of activity of an access device. For example, Pitsoulakis describes a Light Emitting Diode (LED) that indicates the presence of a synchronized connection when green, that indicates the presence of an unsynchronized connection when yellow, and that indicates no connection when off. Pitsoulakis further describes a linear array of 6 LEDs to indicate activity of an access device. Only a few of the six LEDs are lit when there is only a little amount of activity, and all of the LEDs are lit when activity is at or near 100%. Pitsoulakis, [0034]. The cited portions of Pitsoulakis do not disclose or suggest extinguishing an LED when an information service is not in operation. In Pitsoulakis, the activity LEDs may all be off, indicating no activity, without necessarily indicating that the information service is not in operation. Therefore, the cited portions of Pitsoulakis do not

disclose or suggest a data detection mechanism operable to extinguish an access signal when a remote information service is not in operation, as in claim 14.

Brown describes a modem 12 in communication with a Cable TV (CATV) provider. A controller 60 of the modem 12 initiates registration of the modem 12. The registration is completed when a configuration of the modem 12 matches a configuration that is previously stored at the CATV head-end. Light Emitting Diodes (LEDs) 89 indicate an on-line state when the configurations match. In Brown, the LEDs may be lit when an information service is not in operation. This is because the configurations can match even though the information service is not in operation. Therefore, the cited portions of Brown do not disclose or suggest a data detection mechanism operable to extinguish an access signal when a remote information service is not in operation, as in claim 14.

Therefore, the cited portions of Pitsoulakis and Brown, individually or in combination, fail to disclose or suggest the specific combination of claim 14. Hence, claim 14 is allowable. Claims 15-18 are allowable, at least by virtue of their dependence from claim 14.

The cited portions of Pitsoulakis and Brown do not disclose or suggest the specific combination of claim 19. For example, the cited portions of Pitsoulakis and Brown do not disclose or suggest a second indicator operable to indicate when a remote information service is not in operation, as in claim 19.

Pitsoulakis describes a modem with indicator lights to indicate a Digital Subscriber Line (DSL) connection, connection synchronization, and an amount of activity of an access device. For example, Pitsoulakis describes a Light Emitting Diode (LED) that indicates the presence of a synchronized connection when green, that indicates the presence of an unsynchronized connection when yellow, and that indicates no connection when off. Pitsoulakis further describes a linear array of 6 LEDs to indicate activity of an access device. Only a few of the six LEDs are lit when there is only a little amount of activity, and all of the LEDs are lit when activity is at or near 100%. Pitsoulakis, [0034]. In Pitsoulakis, the activity LEDs may all be off, indicating no activity, without necessarily indicating that the information service is not in operation. Therefore, the cited portions of Pitsoulakis do not disclose or suggest a second

indicator operable to indicate when a remote information service is not in operation, as in claim 19.

Brown describes a modem 12 in communication with a Cable TV (CATV) provider. A controller 60 of the modem 12 initiates registration of the modem 12. The registration is completed when a configuration of the modem 12 matches a configuration that is previously stored at the CATV head-end. Light Emitting Diodes (LEDs) 89 indicate an on-line state when the configurations match. In Brown, the LEDs may be lit when an information service is not in operation. This is because the configurations can match even though the information service is not in operation. Therefore, the cited portions of Brown do not disclose or suggest a second indicator operable to indicate when a remote information service provider is not in operation, as in claim 19.

Therefore, the cited portions of Pitsoulakis and Brown, individually or in combination, fail to disclose or suggest the specific combination of claim 19. Hence, claim 19 is allowable. Claims 20-21 are allowable, at least by virtue of their dependence from claim 19.

Claim 4 is Allowable

The Office has rejected claim 4, under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a), as being unpatentable over Pitsoulakis, in view of Brown, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,553,022 ("Hartmaier"). Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

Claim 4 depends from claim 1. As explained above, the cited portions of Pitsoulakis and Brown fail to disclose or suggest at least one element of claim 1. The cited portions of Hartmaier fail to disclose or suggest the elements of claim 1 not disclosed or suggested by the cited portions of Pitsoulakis and Brown. For example, the cited portions of Hartmaier fail to disclose or suggest extinguishing a visual indication of accessibility of an information service when the information service is not in operation, as in claim 1. Hartmaier describes determining if a subscriber is authorized to access a network. Hartmaier, col. 5, ll.21-36. The cited portions of Hartmaier fail to disclose or suggest extinguishing a visual indication of accessibility of an information service when the information service is not in operation, as in claim 1. Thus, the cited portions of Pitsoulakis, Brown, and Hartmaier, individually or in combination, fail to

disclose at least one element of claim 1, from which claim 4 depends. Hence, claim 4 is allowable, at least by virtue of its dependence from an allowable claim.

CONCLUSION

Applicants have pointed out specific features of the claims not disclosed, suggested, or rendered obvious by the cited portions of the references as applied in the Office Action. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of each of the objections and rejections, as well as an indication of the allowability of each of the pending claims.

Any changes to the claims in this response, which have not been specifically noted to overcome a rejection based upon the cited art, should be considered to have been made for a purpose unrelated to patentability, and no estoppel should be deemed to attach thereto.

The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned attorney at the telephone number listed below if such a call would in any way facilitate allowance of this application.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any fees, which may be required, or credit any overpayment, to Deposit Account Number 50-2469.

Respectfully submitted,

1-14-2010
Date

Jeffrey G. Toler, Reg. No. 38,342
Attorney for Applicants
TOLER LAW GROUP, INTELLECTUAL PROPERTIES
8500 Bluffstone Cove, Suite A201
Austin, Texas 78759
(512) 327-5515 (phone)
(512) 327-5575 (fax)